



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,133	12/31/2003	Seiji Takahashi	247309US2	6850
22850 7590 06/10/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER GODBOLD, DOUGLAS				
ART UNIT 2626		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 06/10/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/748,133

**Applicant(s)**

TAKAHASHI, SEIJI

**Examiner**

DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD

**Art Unit**

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2010.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-14 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-14 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/22)  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to correspondence filed April 2, 2010 in reference to application 10/748,133. Claims 1-6, and 8-14 are pending and have been examined.

***Response to Amendment***

2. The amendment filed April 2, 2010 has been accepted and considered in this office action. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-10 have been amended and claim 7 cancelled.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-10, with respect to claims 1, 8 and 9 and the rejection of these claims over Heiny and Filder have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Regarding applicant's arguments, see Remarks, page 10, that Sieier or Krishnamurthy fail to cure the deficiencies of Heiny and Fidler, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner believes that Seiler teaches the limitations in question as laid out in the rejection below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-3, 4, 6, 8-11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heiny (US Patent 5,778,356) in view of Seilder et al. (US Patent 7,412,374).

7. Consider claim 1, Heiny teaches an information service apparatus for providing information to a terminal connected through a network in accordance with a request sent from the terminal (figure 4), the information service apparatus comprising:

an operation panel configured to display operation information on said information service apparatus (figure 4, monitor 116; column 7 line 53);

a language correspondence judgment part configured to judge whether or not the information can be provided in a language designated by discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal (figure 17, user selecting client language, step 403, determination if client language is found; column 15 lines 5-7 and 20-26); and

a language determination part configured to determine the language to be used in providing said information (figure 17, display language selected; column 15 lines 5-36),

wherein, when said language correspondence judgment means determines that said information in the language designated by said discrimination information cannot be provided, said language determination means sets a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel as the language used for providing

said information (default language is selected if client language is not available, column 15 lines 26-36.).

Heiny does not specifically teach an interface configured to receive a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel; and said language determination part acquires language data corresponding to the the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel and selects said acquired language data as language data of said language used for providing the information.

In the same field of multi-lingual internet support, Sieler teaches an interface configured to receive a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel (column 5 line 23, user's browser can provide the language. One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that language settings of a browser may be selected by a user, whether through adjusting properties in the browser, or by choosing a language during installation); and

said language determination part acquires language data corresponding to the the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel and selects said acquired language data as language data of said language used for providing the information (column 5 line 23, user's browser can provide the language to be used. This is added to the ranked list from which it is determined what language to use, column 5 line 24. ).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the browser language detection of Sieler with the system of

Hieny in order to allow a user to select the language used in the "fall back mode" when a preferred language is not available.

8. Consider claim 2, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, but does not specifically teach further comprising discrimination information existence judgment means for judging whether said discrimination information is contained in the request from said terminal, wherein said language determination means sets said operation panel language as said language used for providing said information when said discrimination information existence judgment means judges that said discrimination information is not contained in the request from said terminal.

In the same field of language determination, Seiler teaches discrimination information existence judgment means for judging whether said discrimination information is contained in the request from said terminal, wherein said language determination means sets said operation panel language as said language used for providing said information when said discrimination information existence judgment means judges that said discrimination information is not contained in the request from said terminal (Figures 6A and 6B show a flowchart for selecting a language, described column 6 lines 35-62. Within this flowchart, determination is made whether each language selection option is present, for instance step 625 described line 33, and if not finds the language information from the next source, step 630 described line 35.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deal with missing language information by going onto the next source

as taught by Seiler when selecting language information is Heiny in order to properly handle a situation where a user failed to select a client language for a query.

9. Consider claim 3, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein a plurality of languages are supported as the language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel so as to use one language previously selected from among the plurality of languages when displaying the operation information on said operation panel (figure 8A and 8B show a plurality of supported languages that are user selectable; column 13 lines 51-column 14 line 2, also column 8 lines 42- column 9 line 45).

10. Consider claim 4, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 3, wherein, when the language designated by the discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal corresponds to none of said plurality of supported languages, said language correspondence judgment means judges that said information cannot be provided in the language designated by said discrimination information (if no result can be displayed in client or default language, null value is returned; column 15 lines 26-29).

11. Consider claim 6, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein said information service apparatus is an image processing apparatus (figure 27 for instance shows an image of the system displayed on a screen.).

12. Consider claim 8, Heiny teaches an information service system (figure 4) comprising:

a terminal connected to a network (top portion of figure 4); and

an information service apparatus configured to send information to said terminal through said network in accordance with a request sent from said terminal (bottom portion 132; knowledge base server),

wherein said information service apparatus comprises:

an operation panel configured to display operation information corresponding to said information service apparatus (figure 4, monitor 116; column 7 line 53);

language correspondence judgment part configured to judge whether or not the information can be provided in a language designated by discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal (figure 17, user selecting client language, step 403, determination if client language is found; column 15 lines 5-7 and 20-26); and

language determination part configured to determine the language to be used in providing said information, wherein, when said language correspondence judgment part determines that said information in the language designated by said discrimination information cannot be provided, said language determination part acquires language data corresponding to the language sets a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel as the language used for providing said information (figure 17, default language is selected if client language is not available, column 15 lines 26-36); and



said terminal displays said information in the language determined by said language determination means (figure 17 steps 404 and 407, displaying information in language selected).

Heiny does not specifically teach an interface configured to receive a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel; and

said language determination part acquires language data corresponding to the the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel and selects said acquired language data as language data of said language used for providing the information.

In the same field of multi-lingual internet support, Sieler teaches an interface configured to receive a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel (column 5 line 23, user's browser can provide the language. One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that language settings of a browser may be selected by a user, whether through adjusting properties in the browser, or by choosing a language during installation); and

said language determination part acquires language data corresponding to the the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel and selects said acquired language data as language data of said language used for providing the information (column 5 line 23, user's browser can provide the language to be used. This is added to the ranked list from which it is determined what language to use, column 5 line 24. ).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the browser language detection of Sieler with the system of Hienny in order to allow a user to select the language used in the "fall back mode" when a preferred language is not available.

13. Consider claim 9, Heiny teaches an information service method for providing information from an information service apparatus to a terminal connected to said information service apparatus through a network in accordance with a request sent from said terminal (figure 17), comprising:

a language correspondence judgment procedure performed by the information service apparatus of judging whether or not the information can be provided in a language designated by discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal (figure 17, user selecting client language, step 403, determination if client language is found; column 15 lines 5-7 and 20-26); and

a language determination procedure performed by the information service apparatus of determining the language to be used in providing said information (figure 17, display language selected; column 15 lines 5-36),

wherein, when said language correspondence judgment procedure determines that said language used for displaying said operation information on said information in the language designated by said discrimination information cannot be provided, said language determination procedure sets an operation panel language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel as the language used for providing

said information (figure 17, default language is selected if client language is not available, column 15 lines 26-36).

Heiny does not specifically teach receiving at an interface of the service apparatus, a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel; and

said language determination procedure selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information.

In the same field of multi-lingual internet support, Fidler teaches receiving at an interface of the service apparatus, a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for "system use"); and

said language determination procedure selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for "system use" when system cannot determine language. When combined with Heiny, this would be the "fall back mode" described with Hieny).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system default selection of Fidler with the system of Hieny in order to allow a user to select the language used in the "fall back mode" when a preferred language is not available.

14. Claim 10 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 2, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

15. Claim 11 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 3, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

16. Claim 12 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 4, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

17. Claim 14 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 6, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

18. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heiny and Seiler as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Krishnamurthy et al. (Key differences between HTTP/1.0 and HTTP/1.1).

19. Consider claim 5, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, but does not specifically teach wherein the request from said terminal is a HTTP request, and said discrimination information is a value of an Accept-Language field included in said HTTP request.

In the same field of information retrieval, Krishnamurthy teaches using an HTTP request (abstract and introduction), and with discrimination information being a value of

an Accept-Language field included in said HTTP request (section 10, content negotiation discusses using "Accept-language" fields to inform servers what languages are acceptable to a user, paragraphs 1 and 5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use HTTP and "accept—language" as taught by Krishnamurthy in the system of Heiny in order to implement the system of Heiny in a well know and universally accepted protocol language.

20. Claim 13 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 5, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

### ***Conclusion***

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD whose telephone number is (571)270-1451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00am-4:30pm Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/748,133

Page 14

Art Unit: 2626

/Richmond Dorvil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626